

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

MARY MATSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C10-1528 RAJ

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff Mary Matson's Motion for Reconsideration or Clarification ("Motion"). Dkt. # 283. Plaintiff requests that this Court "reconsider portions of its Order Granting in Part Plaintiff's Second Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs (Dkt. #282) relating to whether Plaintiff's First Fee Petition (Dkt. #129) and associated briefing (Dkt. #149 & 151) are ripe for adjudication and determination." Dkt. # 283 at 1.

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will be granted only upon a "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local R. W.D. Wash. ("LCR") 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has failed to meet this standard. Plaintiff does not identify any new facts or authority that the Court did not consider in its

1 Order granting in part Plaintiff's Second Fee Petition. Dkt. # 282. In its Order, the Court
2 declined to consider a single footnote reference as a sufficient request, under this Court's
3 Local Rules or the Federal Rules, that the Court reconsider its earlier Order (Dkt. # 159)
4 finding the First Fee Petition moot. Dkt. # 282 at 17. Plaintiff's Motion cites no
5 authority that would compel the Court to change this reasoning.

6 Plaintiffs also have not yet properly moved for the Court to rule on the First Fee
7 Petition in a manner permitted by this Court's Local Rules and the Federal Rules of Civil
8 Procedure. Plaintiff apparently wants this Court to reconsider its earlier Order denying
9 Plaintiff's **First** Fee Petition (Dkt. # 159), but it does not ask for this relief in its Motion.
10 Instead Plaintiff only requests the Court reconsider "portions" of its **Second** Fee Petition
11 Order (Dkt. # 282). Dkt. # 283 at 1. While the Court realizes this may seem to Plaintiff
12 to be an overly technical interpretation of her requests, the Court wishes to impress upon
13 Plaintiff that it will not reconsider its previous orders *sua sponte* or by implication. The
14 Court will not grant relief that is not specifically requested in accordance with the Local
15 and Federal Rules.

16 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**.

17
18 Dated this 13th day of August, 2018.

19
20
21 

22 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27